

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County



305 E. WALNUT STREET, P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
Tom Sieber, Chair; James Kneiszel, Vice Chair
Richard Schadewald, John Vander Leest, Keith Deneys

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2019
5:00 p.m.
Room 207, City Hall
100 N. Jefferson St., Green Bay, WI

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE COMMITTEE MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM
LISTED ON THE AGENDA

**** REVISED ****

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Approve/Modify Agenda.
- III. Approve/Modify Minutes of June 6, 2019.

Treasurer

1. Review of Treasurers Dept. Budget Performance Report for Jan - May 2019 (unaudited).
2. Treasurer's Report.
3. Discussion and possible action on the sale of the following tax deed parcel located in the City of Green Bay to the City of Green Bay Redevelopment Authority:

<u>Parcel #</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Municipal Sale \$</u>
3-1063-2	227 S Buchanan St., Green Bay 54303	\$ 9,988.38 + \$ 30 + conditions
4. Discussion and possible action on the sale of the following tax deed parcels located in the Town of Rockland to the Brown County Parks Dept.:

<u>Parcel #</u>	<u>County Purchase \$</u>
R-235-1	= \$ 392.29 + a \$30 Deed Recording Fee = \$ 422.29 Total
R-319-1	= \$ 392.29 + a \$30 Deed Recording Fee = \$ 422.29 Total

Both have 3-20-2019 Assessed Values of \$ 2,200 which will result in a 2019 Property Tax bill of approximately \$ 37 each parcel. The 2019 property tax bills can be budgeted for and paid in 2020 (by 1-31-20) if the Parks Dept. wishes to push that to 2020. We cannot take and hold these 2019 property tax payments in-advance until 8-1-19. The Parcels will become exempt from taxation 1-1-2020 for the 2020 tax year and beyond.
5. Discussion of Brown County owned Parcel 21-1293-2 at 1739 Main St. Green Bay, WI FINAL CASE CLOSURE WITH CONTINUING OBLIGATIONS.
6. Per Brown County Ordinance 3.06 (5)(c), Discussion and possible action on the sale back to Former Owner of the following tax deed parcels from the 4-1-2019 Judgment of Circuit Court Case # 18CV1314:

<u>Parcel</u>	<u>Address</u>
B-367-8	2476 Valley Heights Dr. in the Village of Bellevue - Former Owner Bradley T. Dachelet.
3-40	852 Shawano Ave. in the City of Green Bay - Former Owner Perry J. Lappen.
AL-1094-3	347 Greene Ave. - Former Owner Jean Weinshel.

Other

- 6a. Budget Adjustment Request (19-051): Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount.
7. Audit of bills.
8. Such other matters as authorized by law.
9. Adjourn.

Tom Sieber, Chair

Notice is hereby given that action by the Committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda. Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Administration Committee was held on Wednesday, June 6, 2019 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, WI

Present: Chair Sieber, Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Kneiszel, Supervisor Deneys, Supervisor Vander Leest
Also Present: Supervisor Van Dyck, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Attorney Brent Haroldson, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Technology Services Director August Neverman, County Executive Troy Streckenbach, Child Support Administrator Maria Lasecki and other interested parties.

I. Call to Order.

This meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Sieber at 5:30 pm.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to move Items 6 & 7 to follow *Comments from the Public*. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of May 2, 2019.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

1. Review minutes of:

a. Housing Authority (April 15, 2019).

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public – None.

Although shown in proper format here, Items 6 & 7 were taken at this time.

Communications

2. Communication from Supervisor Van Dyck re: Request that Corporation Counsel draft a resolution stating that no Brown County records, currently stored anywhere within the Veterans Memorial Complex, including but not limited to the Old Packer Hall of Fame, will be stored within the new Brown County Expo building when complete or within the Resch Center. In addition, I request that the appropriate County department develop a storage plan for all archived County documents for implementation no later than the 2021 operational and capital budget plan. *Referred from May County Board.*

Supervisor Van Dyck informed his intent was to get this in resolution form in an attempt to make sure this actually happens. Initially there was storage planned for the new Expo, but Van Dyck was not sure everyone knew that until the last moment. The reason the storage was incorporated into the facility is because the County had records stored in the old Hall of Fame so they were attempting to make room for those records in the Expo but once this came to light, it did not seem to make sense to store records in what is probably the most expensive real estate in the County.

Van Dyck believed the second story records storage area has been removed from the plan, but now there is an area on the first floor that can be used for storage, but if the County does not use it, PMI has a use for it. Before we get to the point where this is done and records are moved back into the Expo, Van Dyck wanted to get it on record that the Board would support it so this becomes a priority in planning and budgeting. His fear is if this is not done, the records will be hauled back into the new building.

Supervisor Schadewald said it appeared Van Dyck is talking about the old Hall of Fame records, not all County records. Van Dyck informed he is talking about the roughly 5000 square of feet of records in the Hall of Fame. The second part is to try to come up with a plan for all records storage, not just that particular group of records. Van Dyck did realize that Technology Services Director August Neverman is working on something with regard to this.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger said according to Neverman there are about 6000 records. Technology Services is the department that is responsible for storage and maintenance of records. As discussed in the past, it would make sense to find a central location for storage of all documents and if the rent was reasonable, the operational costs could be covered by the amount that is actually being paid out right now. Weininger understood Van Dyck's concerns, but the problem with a resolution is that a fiscal has to be attached, but that is going to be almost impossible as Weininger does not have an idea of the cost as he does not have a plan from Neverman.

Schadewald noted if the records are stored in the Expo for now, then as space becomes available elsewhere in the County in the future, such as possibly in the downtown jail, the records could then be moved there. He is afraid of a resolution being iron clad. Weininger noted we are at levy limits and we have to find ways to save funds and this may be a way to do it, but Neverman has to find space available for this. There has to be a plan before the operational costs can be determined.

Van Dyck understood we have to come up with a plan, but his concern is if we don't push the plan, the records will go back in the Expo because that's the easiest thing to do, and then we can say the records will be moved later, but there is a cost to that and the likelihood of that actually happening is not that great. He understood this is going to take money, but felt what we need to consider is what makes the most sense to the County for the long term basis, not what the cheapest route at the moment is. The Board needs to have some direction from Administration and the Department Head to figure out the options so the records do not go back into the Expo.

Chair Sieber noted language could be included in a resolution that specifies a sum to not exceed for storage. The whole idea of the resolution is to develop a plan for this. Weininger wished to clarify a few things and said the whole back space that was added has been eliminated. The space that is there now is in existence whether records are stored there or not. The space in the Expo is free and open and although it may not be the ideal location for records, it makes sense fiscally.

Schadewald said the way budgets work when at levy, if you put something in writing and have to do it, that is money that cannot be used for something else. He would prefer to explore and look at other options and noted that the records would just be moved 150 yards from where they have been for years. Van Dyck reiterated that his issue is moving the records from a building that was basically useless when the Hall of Fame moved out, to a \$95 million dollar Expo hall. It blows his mind that we would have to carve out storage in the new facility to put permanent record storage in and he added that that is not even all the records the County has. He feels record storage is a capital item and funds from somewhere else could be available down the road which could be used for storage.

Supervisor Vander Leest was not in support of a resolution at this time. He feels using the option available at the Expo is what is fiscally responsible. Instead of PMI using the space, he would rather see the County use the space. He does not feel we need a resolution for this; we just need to be keen to the opportunities that might come about in the future. For the short term he would like to play it by ear and not do anything that would cost additional money. As time moves on, there may be other opportunities for storage and we could work with.

111

Supervisor Kneiszel appreciated Van Dyck's sentiment and said he agreed with it to a degree, but he would prefer to receive and place this on file. He believes the majority of Supervisors want to go the way Van Dyck wants to go, but that makes it more difficult to choose a cost effective or logical short term solution and for that reason he is not in favor of a resolution at this time.

Supervisor Deneys said his concern is that a resolution would lock us in but we need to be able to be open to be looking at different options. He is not in favor of putting the records at the Expo, but if it comes down to it and there is no place else to put them, we might as well put them in the free and open space at the Expo.

Schadewald appreciated Van Dyck's efforts and was in support of a resolution with the understanding that we would look at ways to store things more efficiently and in more of a centralized location outside of the Expo. He does not see this as all or nothing. Schadewald would like to direct Administration to update the Committee periodically on storage.

Sieber commented he and Van Dyck have had numerous conversations about how ridiculous it was to store documents in the Expo. The County currently has documents stored offsite by a third party because we do not have areas for storage that have things like fire protection and cameras. If the County has a building for document storage with those protections, we could save money by bringing the documents back from the third party and storing them ourselves. Sieber continued that we have all been around County government long enough to realize that things get forgotten and left behind and having a resolution on the record saying we do not want documents stored permanently in the Expo would be a good thing. This would not commit future Boards to anything, it would simply be expressing the will of this Board that we do not want documents stored in the Expo building and that we feel there is better use for that space than document storage. He will vote no on the motion.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to receive and place communication on file and direct Technology Services Director to update the Committee twice a year with reports about storage options other than the Expo Center with the understanding that the preference is to not have records there by 2021. Vote taken. Ayes: Schadewald, Kneiszel, Deneys, Vander Leest Nay: Sieber MOTION CARRIED 4 to 1.

Resolutions & Ordinances

3. Resolution Supporting Brown County's Digital Vision.

Oliver Buesche, founder of My Strategy Source, a consulting business that specializes in digital transformation introduced himself.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach said what he is attempting to do as County Executive is to create an environment that allows for businesses and families to want to locate and live in this community. He ran on the simple principle of managing financing in a manner that allows residents to want to live here and businesses to be successful here. At the same time, as research has been done, it has been realized that if NE Wisconsin does not figure out how to be competitive in the future, we will be trying to figure out where the people have gone and what we need to be doing to be sure we have business startups in the community versus where they are happening now. As part of the discussion and research done around the STEM Center, it was realized that NE Wisconsin was losing out on research and development.

Streckenbach read from a statement by Ray Cross that said, in part, "The Fresh Water Collaborative of Wisconsin will attract local, regional and global talent to Wisconsin, helping make us the Silicon Valley of water. It is another example of how invaluable our University system is and how our campuses are meeting the needs of Wisconsin and the nation." The reality is that we sit on the second largest area of fresh water globally. Water is going to be something that is vital in the future and Streckenbach believed we have the capacity to potentially create those solutions right here in NE Wisconsin through the Engineering School that will be housed at the STEM Center. In

///

looking at food processing and food security, we also have the ability right here with the clusters to have a say in that, but we will not be at the table if we do not do some things that will put us in a position to actually have a seat at the table. One of those things was the STEM Center and Streckenbach applauded the County Board for that project. The reality is that the world is changing quickly and Streckenbach talked about what can be done to make Brown County successful, and the fact that we are investing fiber throughout the community and have found ways to allow for that to happen in areas that are distressed or HUD zones.

Streckenbach continued that Oliver Buesche came to him 1 ½ years ago and explained a process to help the County prepare for the future. In looking at industrial changes and revolutions in terms of technology, it used to take 10 – 40 years for things to take foot, but today things are being disrupted in several years and the question is what are we doing as a community to prepare ourselves to be part of the discussions. It is not the fear of the robots, it is more about preparing our community to be part of the changes and be engaged in them. Streckenbach said the question is do we want to be part of the wake or do we want to be the wave? As part of this discussion, he felt it was important to have this conversation on a statewide level so this was brought to the WCA and they agreed to fund a county symposium that took place in three different counties in 2018. After successfully completing the first phase the question was posed “what are you going to do in your communities to make change or start the conversation”.

In the budget deliberations for 2019, Streckenbach put in his budget and discussed the County wanting to do a second phase which was approved and we were able to leverage the County’s dollars along with the WCA’s dollars to bring in Buesche to help us devise a digital vision, which is included in the agenda packet along with the proposed resolution.

Streckenbach continued that staff has done a good job of outlining what we are trying to accomplish in the resolution, but more importantly, is is putting us in a mindset to embrace the discussions. He reiterated that things are changing quickly and he wants Brown County to be a leader in those changes. By the Board passing the proposed resolution, Brown County will be the first county in the State, and maybe nationally, that will adopt a digital vision. As a County Executive, Streckenbach wants to have a seat at the table and wants the community talking about this so people take notice. There are a host of opportunities out there for Brown County to make positive change globally. In looking at all the things we are trying to do as a County, this is about putting NE Wisconsin on the map. To turn a blind eye as to what technology is doing in the economy and to not be part of the conversation is a lost opportunity. This is about creating opportunities to be at the table, to start talking to the private sector, government and higher education about looking at ways we can be part of the discussion.

Creating the Brown County Digital Vision Statement was the first thing that was accomplished through the engagement with Buesche. The vision statement reads, “Brown County will reimagine the services we provide by embracing digital technology in a way that is inclusive and respectful to everyone’s personal and professional information and needs.” The journey of the County to get to the vision statement is outlined in the agenda packet. Streckenbach referred to the last page of the agenda materials that outlines Brown County’s next steps. Part of the ongoing discussion regarding digital transformation and evolution is looking at what is happening with artificial intelligence and the internet and the use of data that is getting mixed and whether it is appropriate or not. Government needs to start talking about this because every day data is being created. Right now there are 6 billion devices connected to the internet, but by 2020 there will 20 billion devices using the internet and creating data. At some point, Streckenbach would like to see our University at the table in a level comparable to Madison. We can have clusters that can allow us to be powerful in the future and we need to start being engaged and talking about this.

Streckenbach intends to create a steering committee that will create committees to talk about public safety issue, smart mobility corridors, access and ethics. In essence, this is scratching the surface on where this can go.

Streckenbach and Buesche feel in order to gain the attention of the state and other counties, Brown County needs to |||

take a position and signify this. If this goes the way Streckenbach intends it to, slowly but surely Brown County will be noticed and experts in the community will ask us to sit at the table and that is key for the long term journey and being a strong County which equates to having a strong region which the region relies on.

There is no fiscal impact on the resolution as the resolution is adopting a vision and stating to the public that we feel this is important.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve the resolution as presented.

Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Treasurer

4. Per Brown County Ordinance 3.06(5)(c), Discussion and possible action on the sale back to Former Owner of the following tax deed parcels from the Judgment of Circuit Court Case #18CV1314:

<u>Parcel</u>	<u>Address</u>
HM-123	Finger Road
HM-124	425 S. Vandenberg Road

Erin Strohbehn - Partner at Gimbel, Reily, Guerin & Brown LLP - 330 East Kilbourn Ave., Milwaukee

Siebert provided a handout, a response from the Treasurer (attached), as he was unable to attend the meeting. Atty Strohbehn believed Zeller was reacting to her client's daughter's request. She was not there on behalf of Pamela Gracyalny but retained because Marilyn Gracyalny was going to be taking certain actions to have Pamela Gracyalny removed as her Power of Attorney and Trustee. She was there in an independent capacity on behalf of Marilyn Gracyalny. This was not Pamela coming and seeking repurchase of the parcels. Strohbehn practiced probate and trust litigation, she got retained frequently by either the families of elderly individuals or elderly individuals when they find themselves in situation where they had been taken advantage of or their rights have not been prosecuted. She had gotten involved in this action because her client Marilyn was a quadriplegic in her 70s, her husband passed away in September of 2011 and four months later she had an accident and had been quad ever since. Marilyn and her husband had one daughter and she was a lawyer. Unfortunately she had not insured that her mom's finances had been cared for and protected. Marilyn has had nearly no ability to care for her own personal or financial needs since her action. She had continued to live in her own home with 24 hour live in care. Her daughter took over all aspects of her financial life. In 2018, just shortly before her accident, Marilyn inherited her family farm and a piece a property that had been owned by her mother since her father died in 1953. Her mother farmed it well into her 70s and now it was being farmed by a neighbor family who had maintained the farmland, the home on the property was presumed livable but no one had lived there for some period of time. Marilyn had no idea that the property taxes were not paid. She did not receive the notices, Pam did at her own home and did not tell Marilyn anything about this situation. In fact, Marilyn with the help of her daughter sought out an attorney in Crystal Lake, Illinois to prepare a trust for her last year. That lawyer prepared the trust and transferred these two parcels into the trust and all the while Marilyn had no idea all of the tax delinquencies. Strohbehn was hired yesterday and for that reason she did not have with her a certified check to get this property back in the black and to outstretch their hands in an attempt that they were present in good faith. Marilyn was ready, willing and able to purchase back this property and could have certified payment here Monday morning. Marilyn had retained her firm to take the appropriate steps to insure that her duties are not being neglected. Strohbehn was present to ask that this committee exercise the discretion it had and to allow Marilyn or her trust to make this right, to make the county whole, to purchase back the farmland that has been in their family for decades. She knew this wasn't a normal circumstance and her client was coming to plead mercy but that was the best way to proceed at this point in time. She was ready willing and able to try to reopen the judgement in Brown County, although she'd rather not have her client spend additional money on something that wasn't her fault. Her client was taking action to take back her financial life and she asked at this point in time that the committee allow her to repurchase her property. She did recognize that because she was just retained she did not have the

opportunity or time to submit certain materials to them, she was happy to supplement the record or set this matter over until she could provide whatever information the committee wanted. She was asking that they allow her client to make this wrong right.

Hemery stated if the committee were to decide to sell back, he asked that a motion be made to sell to the former owner or trust at the discretion of Corporation Counsel giving the committee a couple days to figure out which one of those was preferable and get the total amounts from the Treasurer to make the county whole. Responding to Hemery, Strohbehn informed there were no mortgages or liens on the property as it was inherited free and clear through a probate process in 2008.

Kneiszel questioned if this was to not pass, would there be legal action. Strohbehn informed there would be not against the county. She informed she sought alternate route to relief from her client as seeking a motion to vacate the default judgement in Brown County and that would be her next course of action. Hemery stated it was within a courts powers to allow someone to reopen a judgment and was not that unusual of a motion. The county currently owned the property and the court had executed a judgement to that affect. Hemery informed that Director Fontecchio indicated that he didn't want to strongly challenge this or make a statement but should the board keep the property for the county, his department would be interested in it. He had not taken a strong position one way or another. He was noncommittal given the circumstances of this particular case. Kneiszel stated he was not prepared to do anything with this in their favor because how did he know who to believe as it was being told off the spur of the moment and it might now be true, how would he know? He would want some proof to this affect. Basically his opinion was to agree with the Treasurer at this point. He questioned if he was not aware of the new development. Hemery responded that he had been dealing exclusively with the attorney daughter in Chicago. Kneiszel felt it would be really important to have the Treasurer involved in this and see if it changed his opinion. If it came to a vote today, he would go with what his opinion was and not sell the property back. Hemery felt it was important that the committee take some action today to deny or approve because the properties went to auction and the Treasurer had schedules on all of them and sometimes time was very much of the essence when he had properties for various reasons. They could put it off for a month but it was extra cost for the county. Kneiszel stated it sounded like they could get it back, Hemery agreed. He hoped to have a decision today but it was full discretion of the county. Kneiszel was sorry to hear that the client was not in a great place but again he didn't see any proof of what the situation was and a vast majority of his constituents were reliable tax payers who don't wait four years and not pay their taxes and run to the county, tell a story and get the property back. Strohbehn stated this committee had significant discretion in various and sundry cases or matters before the county, this was one of those situations. The ordinances don't lay out some sort of a proof process or a specific procedure under which she could litigate this to the committee. That is why she suggested to them that if there was some sort of proof that they would like submitted by affidavit as it would be hard to promise that she would be able to get her client there in the committee room. Her job was to present evidence either to a court or to a committee like this. The way she would present this evidence to Brown County Circuit Court was by affidavit which was sworn testimony from her client or she hoped from her cooperating daughter who would explain exactly what happened here. So if there was a concern there was a way that she would present proof to the court and she asked for that same exact opportunity to present proof to this committee. If that meant this being set off a month, then she ask that it be sent off a month. Kneiszel's bottom line was that he would not support selling this property back tonight. He would support denying it but not selling it back because he didn't know anybody a party here and wished it didn't come before them. For all they knew, the owner could have known about this for years and all he had what was being told tonight and nothing legal or an affidavit.

Vander Leest suggested a motion to sell the property back, he felt Strohbehn could give them the information and documentation they needed. If this person had the property in their hands for that many years, it was a legitimate request. As far as the daughter not bringing the tax records/information, it very easily could happen and a lot of things were taken for granted from family members. Mr. Hemery gave conditions to be made whole on the taxes through 2019 and whatever conditions that he puts forward, he would support that to get the property in the right

hands. He felt she wouldn't be coming before the committee unless she was trustworthy to begin with.

Schadewald didn't buy that they couldn't wait 30 days argument, there were auctions all the time. He would rather have the affidavit submitted. If the motion failed he would like to have a motion where they direct Corporation Counsel to talk to the r and get the information needed. He was concerned hearing that someone in Illinois put it in a trust, which was a red flag to him because he didn't know what that meant legally. Their goal was that they try to do the best for their citizenry. Unusual was the name of the game with tax deeds so they were well versed on unusual. They try to do due diligence that they were getting all things in the correct order so they had no future legal, that it's clear and done. He didn't mind it going back on the tax rolls because it was better for the county but he would prefer that they wait 30 days for Hemery and the Treasurer to come with a recommendation.

Deneys agreed with Kneiszel and couldn't support reselling directly back, he felt they needed to have that proof and they were willing to provide the proof. The motion was to sell back but agreed with Schadewald to hold for 30 days and ask the attorneys to work together to get those affidavits so there is that proof and bring it back next month. He agreed they had ample time to sell the property at public auction, it was only June. As Kneiszel stated, for their citizens, they needed that proof that this was actually the situation that was being laid out before them tonight before they went ahead with the resale.

Kneiszel felt out of the respect of the Treasurer's position, it was imperative that they give him the opportunity to make another recommendation based on any information he can get because he was pretty clear with what he said and if he felt differently after learning more Kneiszel would want to take that into consideration.

Sieber agreed with Vander Leest, he felt it was pretty clear what had happened and didn't think the government should be taking property and selling it at a profit or taking property and using it, it says the wrong message. They had someone present who was willing to pay everything owed to get the property back and it was cut and dry. They were not judges or attorneys but their statutes laid out that this committee was able to be the final say. This was the final step in a very long process. They all got to use their own standards and judgment as far as what they wanted to see in order to either accept or deny the appeal, it was very wide open and he had a low bar if you come with a check or a pledge to pay, he was happy to sell it back to them. They were in the business to serve constituents, not take property from them. In this case they went through 46 bills but if the proper person wasn't getting the bills, what are you going to do? He'd prefer to see them sell it back tonight and not have the owner, who was obviously in a very difficult situation, go through anymore expense or time to get their property back. He was hoping they could sell it back to them for what they owed the county. He informed the July meeting will be on the 17th @ 5pm in Room 207, City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson St., Green Bay, WI.

Kneiszel informed that he would be willing to support Vander Leest's motion if they had the proof for their citizens. Hemery questioned when using the word proof, what were they looking to have submitted? Typically testimony was a big part of it, which they had tonight and he understood why the owner's testimony hasn't been there due to being quadriplegic. They could have an affidavit saying the same thing, which made it a sworn statement but he didn't know what they were looking for when stating present proof to Corporation Counsel. Kneiszel felt he made it clear they could present an affidavit or equal proof that would be required in a court of law.

Strohbehm responded, one clarifying question was will her client be at a disadvantage if she moved forward to vacate the default judgement because as a lawyer she had to do it and now because she knew the circumstances as she was on the case and she was going to file that motion. What she could do was copy the committee on her motion papers and her motion papers were a motion, a brief, any supporting affidavits and that's the case she was presenting essentially to the judge on why it should be reopened. Her concern was if Corporation Counsel and the Treasurer were satisfied with the proof. That meant that the fact finders and decision makers here were not necessarily the members of the committee, so she had a problem from a due process standpoint with shifting their administrative

duty on to someone who didn't have that based on the ordinances. She notes that she went through as many of their meeting minutes that she could and they had not required any other property owner to come in with evidentiary proof. She understood that this was an unusual circumstance and she wished her client was sitting next to her so she could provide the same testimony but that was not possible, she physically was unable. She would ask that her client not be held to a higher evidentiary standard than they held other property owner to. What she's read from the minutes was that someone can come in and say whatever they wanted to. She was an officer of the court and could not lie to the committee. What she was expressing was coming out of her mouth but it was the information provided to her by her client and the same information her client would be providing the committee sitting next to her if she was there. She understood and agreed with the idea that this was about their constituents and what they needed to do for them. Her client was a property owner in this county and she had certain rights and someone else screwed up and someone else ensured that her rights were not protected. She felt her client should have the same ability to come and ask this committee without having to put on would essentially be a full trial to prove that this committee should exercise its jurisdiction and get the property back. She reiterated that she shouldn't be held to a different standard that other property owners were and she ask that that not happen.

Hemery didn't share the same due process concerns. These were all case by case situations. What the committee might feel was required with one case might be entirely different than what they felt was required with another. He had no issue with the committee making a decision based on a contingency such as Corporation Counsel being presented with documents that met the satisfaction prior to the proceeding. He was fundamentally disagreeing with both of those positions in this case. As mentioned she was an officer of the court, they were lawyers and had law licenses and couldn't lie in settings like this so he understood where she was basically an affidavit if she had a duty to be truthful when she came and testifies before a body such as this. If a lawyer lies, they could be reported to the Office of Lawyer Regulations. It was his opinion that this committee had full discretion with whatever options were open.

Sieber stated they can't refer this decision to someone else. If they wanted to say they would sell it back but make sure they got the correct amount they could send it to the Treasurer or verify if documents were legal send it to Corporation Counsel but at the end, the committee had to make the decision.

Responding to questions from Schadewald, Hemery informed he received an email stating their office had been retained by the individual and he felt that was satisfactory in proving Strohbehm was the legal representative. He also had no concerns of the county being liable for future litigation on this property. Assistant Corporation Counsel Brent Haroldson informed they would be present as the petitioners in the action but essentially it wouldn't be litigation against the county, it was to reopen the judgment based on what was going on. The litigation Strohbehm was talking about was between mother and daughter.

Schadewald would like the motion to include the 2019 taxes. A brief discussion was held on whether or not they could collect the 2019 taxes, whether the county owned it or not the taxes were still in effect for the current owner. The Treasurer could get the amounts fairly quickly. Schadewald's request was to serve in good faith.

Deneys didn't think there would be an issue with waiting 30 days or until their next meeting on July 17th to make sure the Treasurer can give them the right amount to make the county whole. He agreed they shouldn't be taking property in this situation but he felt they had a responsibility to their constituents to make sure all the ducks are in a row. Schadewald's concern with waiting was more possible litigation because she'll have a duty to do what's best for her client. The county may not incur any costs but the person would and it got all muddy. He had enough information tonight to say that even if they weren't present and if he heard this scenario he would put the property back on the property tax roll and then made whole. He felt they won't hear anything more than they already know. Hemery stated when talking about being made whole, it would be whatever amount the Treasurer told him which includes the three years of taxes not paid, maintenance on the property, estimated 2019 property taxes, etc. As for a timeline,

he would ask that they have payment in full by certified or cashier's check by next Friday. Hemery will contact the attorney earlier in the week, after talking to the Treasurer, and have payment in hand by June 14, 2019. Strohbehm stated that was doable.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to sell back to the original owner to include expenses incurred in full and 2019 estimated taxes on both properties on or before June 14, 2019. Vote taken. Ayes: Vander Leest, Schadewald, Deneys, Sieber Nay: Kneiszel MOTION CARRIED 4 to 1

County Clerk

5. Budget Status Financial Report for April, 2019 – Unaudited.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Child Support

6. Budget Status Financial Report for April 2019 – Unaudited.

Child Support Director Maria Lasecki reported the Child Support budget is right on target.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Director Summary for May 2019.

Lasecki informed she is in continuous pursuit down in Madison with regard to some of the issues before them. She provided a handout, a copy of which is attached from the Joint Finance Committee. The handout outlines what has been put together for the Legislative Committee for the WCSEA, which Lasecki is a part of. They had asked for \$1.5 million dollars in both of the biennial years within the next budget and the Governor's budget included \$750,000 for the first biennial year and \$1,500,000 in the second year. They had dialogue with many of the legislators over the last few months and the motion brought forward on Tuesday is a different option. It is those numbers, but it is an all funds collective sum of numbers that includes the match, it is not eligible for the match so it is not straight GPR. It is a combination of GPR and the corresponding match to bring each year to those respective numbers. The graph shows the difference which is substantial – about one third of the total amount they were hoping for. Lasecki is still grateful as this will mean about \$61,500 additional revenue which will be permanent. This is a net gain and it was important that Lasecki pointed out the fact that the numbers were a little different than they were hoping for, but it is an increase none the less and they can definitely use the funds.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Technology Services

8. Budget Status Financial Report for April 2019 - Unaudited.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Director's Report.

Technology Services Director August Neverman referred to Item 1 on his report regarding the Council Chambers stating at some point they had to have a discussion. He questioned if they wanted to participate with selection of technology or have him pit something and report back? The equipment in that room had switched over and they had

to do something. The city had already bought their own thing and were done and moved on. He was going to research if the county was allowed to use their system but knew there will be costs involved. However none of the options would be cheap but that would be his first choice so there weren't competing systems within the room. Weininger informed this committee had authority over the contingency funds, they had \$300,000 for one-time expenses and this would be one of those expenses. Neverman informed that as long as they continued to use the space there was a bill that came to TS on behalf of the board which he shared with the board office every year. That will continue but it didn't fix operational problems. It was for the audio video equipment, the audio upload that they weren't using anymore but they bought so the infrastructure was in the room. Cameras and the stuff hooked up to the computer. Neverman would prefer working with a couple County Board members because he needed to get a scope on it. Weininger informed it was administrative so the County Board Chairman would form a group. Sieber agreed and would assist Chairman Moynihan if requested.

The LandNav system, the tax system they were working on for a year and a half, went live and they had been receiving positive feedback. They still had a couple cleanup things, improving the system above and beyond what they originally started with. They already made 57 improvements since it went live beginning of last month. They were off the AS400 and now web based and the community was using it already.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Administration and Human Resources

10. Budget Status Financial Report for April 2019 – Unaudited.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Budget Adjustment Log.

Weininger briefly spoke to Budget Adjustment 19-043 and 19-046 re: information provided in the agenda packet.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. Director's Reports.

Class and Comp – they met with the Judges and their working group as requested. They came back with a formal recommendation, they all voted and it was unanimously. They were going to use what they recommended for their JAs and Court Coordinators. They met with Clerk of Courts Vander Leest and went through the changes and basically based on the information supplied by some additional research everyone excluding one position, the Deputy Clerk because it was raised last time, will be moved up. Vander Leest is supposed to talk to his staff this week and it will lay out all the positions, where they were to where they are now. He's supposed to take any other things that need to be considered it will go back to HR, as soon as it went back to HR it will go to their Internal Review Committee and they will make it public and bring it back to the board.

Weininger informed they were getting other requests, one was looking for a pay increase due to longevity. The policy didn't deal with that, it was based off the position. It didn't allow for general wage increase and was based on compression and a number of things outlined in the policy. When they made some adjustments a number of people questioned why they didn't move as well. It was explained that there was only so much money to go around and it was to get people within the market and they were already in the market.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

///

Wendy Lusardi – Juvenile Deputy Clerk of Courts

Lusardi was not present to fight for more money but to maintain her classification for the last 6 years. Vander Leest scheduled a 10-15 minute meeting to present and she wanted to confirm that if they were not in agreement with the recommendations presented, that they will be able to have some say so in it and present their information they had gathered from outside sources. She was now knocked down two spots and didn't think it was unjust to ask how it was justifiable when she had added duties put on from the last job description in 2013. Will she get those answers on it?

Weininger informed HR took the info provided directly from employees and the stuff funneled through Clerk of Courts Vander Leest. Over the last few weeks they talked to the Judges and the Judges chose counties they felt were comparable so HR used those counties. Lusardi informed they were only used for the Court Coordinators and JAs. Weininger stated these were the counties that were more comparable in the judicial realm which overall helped everyone. Weininger reiterated everyone was getting moved up except the one position. He suggested talking to Vander Leest after the meeting with how he arrived at that and if he can't explain it they will have HR talk through it to get to a point of understanding. She wanted to make sure that she'd get the opportunity to present information and also if it was finalized, if she is downgraded, she wanted justification on how it was done. Sieber wanted to keep informed on how the meeting went and also let Weininger know.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Weininger informed they were starting the budget process and going through the internal services departments which was health insurance, risk insurance and TS. They were working through numbers and should have something hopefully soon and after that will have a better idea on how everything works. Weininger provided maps (attached) re: Total Equalized Value and Net New Construction Value, he went over some increases that were well over what their net new construction will be, that's the county's levy capacity and not a lot of flexibility in the coming budget.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. CIP Update.

No update; no action taken.

Other

14. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to acknowledge receipt of the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.

16. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to adjourn at 8:10 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



Treasurer's Budget Performance Report

Date Range 01/01/19 - 05/31/19

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd
REVENUE								
Fund 100 - General Fund								
Department 080 - Treasurer								
Division 001 - General								
4100	General property taxes	(1,651,976.00)	.00	(1,651,976.00)	(137,664.67)	.00	(688,323.35)	42
4108	Interest on taxes	712,500.00	.00	712,500.00	35,786.68	.00	265,587.31	37
4109	Penalties on taxes	237,500.00	.00	237,500.00	6,092.73	.00	88,571.32	37
4110	Penalties on special assessments	30,000.00	.00	30,000.00	1,224.21	.00	13,959.26	47
4490	Ag use conversion	80,000.00	.00	80,000.00	.00	.00	10,187.58	13
4600	Charges and fees							
4600.890	Charges and fees Tax deed	30,000.00	.00	30,000.00	200.00	.00	20,863.52	70
4600 - Charges and fees Totals		\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00	\$200.00	\$0.00	\$20,863.52	70%
4900	Miscellaneous							
4900	Miscellaneous	1,000.00	.00	1,000.00	212.66	.00	1,503.38	150
4900.150	Miscellaneous Unclaimed funds retained	9,000.00	.00	9,000.00	9,020.25	.00	9,020.25	100
4900 - Miscellaneous Totals		\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$9,232.91	\$0.00	\$10,523.63	105%
4905	Interest	1,527,231.00	.00	1,527,231.00	179,364.21	.00	780,951.28	51
4907	Unrealized Gain or Loss - Interest	(300,000.00)	.00	(300,000.00)	.00	.00	363,086.79	-121
4960	Gain or Loss on Sale - Tax Deeds	30,000.00	.00	30,000.00	.00	.00	38,509.11	128
4990	Cash Over/Short	.00	.00	.00	2.51	.00	7.24	+++
9002	Transfer In							
9002.400	Transfer in Wages	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	4,072.04	+++
9002 - Transfer In Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,072.04	+++
9004	Intrafund Transfer In							
9004.200	Intrafund Transfer In HR	.00	4,517.00	4,517.00	.00	.00	4,517.00	100
9004 - Intrafund Transfer In Totals		\$0.00	\$4,517.00	\$4,517.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,517.00	100%
Division 001 - General Totals								
9004 - Intrafund Transfer In Totals		\$705,255.00	\$4,517.00	\$709,772.00	\$94,238.58	\$0.00	\$912,512.73	129%
Department 080 - Treasurer Totals								
REVENUE TOTALS		\$705,255.00	\$4,517.00	\$709,772.00	\$94,238.58	\$0.00	\$912,512.73	129%



Treasurer's Budget Performance Report

Date Range 01/01/19 - 05/31/19

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd
EXPENSE								
Department 080 - Treasurer								
Division 001 - General								
5100	Regular earnings	267,919.00	3,956.00	271,875.00	17,520.30	.00	96,262.33	35
5102	Paid leave earnings	.00	.00	.00	755.81	.00	1,664.85	+++
5102.100	Paid leave earnings Vacation	.00	.00	.00	21.55	.00	1,832.27	+++
5102.200	Paid leave earnings Personal	.00	.00	.00	454.56	.00	1,129.07	+++
5102.300	Paid leave earnings Casual time used	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	785.12	+++
5102.500	Paid leave earnings Holiday	.00	.00	.00	948.20	.00	948.20	+++
5102.800	Paid leave earnings Disability	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	\$6,359.51	+++
5102 - Paid leave earnings Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,180.12	\$0.00		
5103	Premium	1,225.00	.00	1,225.00	.00	.00	14.67	1
5103.000	Premium Overtime	\$1,225.00	\$0.00	\$1,225.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14.67	1%
5103 - Premium Totals								
5109	Salaries reimbursement	.00	.00	.00	(948.20)	.00	(948.20)	+++
5109.100	Salaries reimbursement Short term disability	.00	.00	.00	(948.20)	.00	(948.20)	+++
5109 - Salaries reimbursement Totals		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$948.20)	\$0.00	(\$948.20)	+++
5110	Fringe benefits	20,592.00	303.00	20,895.00	1,440.51	.00	7,550.77	36
5110.100	Fringe benefits FICA	283.00	.00	283.00	19.76	.00	103.61	37
5110.110	Fringe benefits Unemployment compensation	44,526.00	.00	44,526.00	3,819.84	.00	17,189.28	39
5110.200	Fringe benefits Health Insurance	3,502.00	.00	3,502.00	287.36	.00	1,293.12	37
5110.210	Fringe benefits Dental Insurance	239.00	.00	239.00	28.44	.00	113.76	48
5110.220	Fringe benefits Life Insurance	993.00	.00	993.00	87.56	.00	423.88	43
5110.230	Fringe benefits LT disability insurance	1,392.00	.00	1,392.00	122.76	.00	594.32	43
5110.235	Fringe benefits ST disability insurance	322.00	.00	322.00	26.83	.00	134.15	42
5110.240	Fringe benefits Workers compensation Insurance	16,977.00	259.00	17,236.00	1,175.34	.00	6,232.80	36
5110.300	Fringe benefits Retirement	\$88,826.00	\$562.00	\$89,388.00	\$7,008.40	\$0.00	\$33,635.69	38%
5110 - Fringe benefits Totals								



Treasurer's Budget Performance Report

Date Range 01/01/19 - 05/31/19

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd
5300	Supplies							
5300	Supplies	1,980.00	.00	1,980.00	.00	.00	183.12	9
5300.001	Supplies Office	6,537.00	.00	6,537.00	5.72	.00	1,287.06	20
5300.004	Supplies Postage	29,000.00	.00	29,000.00	799.78	.00	6,622.41	23
	5300 - Supplies Totals	\$37,517.00	\$0.00	\$37,517.00	\$805.50	\$0.00	\$8,092.59	22%
5304	Printing							
5304.100	Printing Forms	11,362.00	.00	11,362.00	.00	.00	.00	0
	5304 - Printing Totals	\$11,362.00	\$0.00	\$11,362.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0%
5305	Dues and memberships	125.00	.00	125.00	.00	.00	100.00	80
5306	Maintenance agreement							
5306.100	Maintenance agreement Software	2,294.00	.00	2,294.00	.00	.00	182.91	8
	5306 - Maintenance agreement Totals	\$2,294.00	\$0.00	\$2,294.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$182.91	8%
5307	Repairs and maintenance							
5307.100	Repairs and maintenance Equipment	1,200.00	.00	1,200.00	152.00	.00	321.74	27
	5307 - Repairs and maintenance Totals	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$152.00	\$0.00	\$321.74	27%
5310	Advertising and public notice	6,000.00	.00	6,000.00	.00	.00	5,005.92	83
5330	Books, periodicals, subscription	320.00	.00	320.00	.00	329.90	.00	103
5340	Travel and training	1,000.00	.00	1,000.00	.00	.00	145.42	15
5390	Miscellaneous	1,000.00	.00	1,000.00	100.00	.00	250.00	25
5392	Service fees	113,000.00	.00	113,000.00	4,881.31	.00	24,685.69	22
5410	Insurance							
5410.400	Insurance Bond	650.00	.00	650.00	.00	.00	866.25	133
	5410 - Insurance Totals	\$650.00	\$0.00	\$650.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$866.25	133%



Treasurer's Budget Performance Report

Date Range 01/01/19 - 05/31/19

Include Rollup Account and Rollup to Account

Account	Account Description	Adopted Budget	Budget Amendments	Amended Budget	Current Month Transactions	YTD Encumbrances	YTD Transactions	% Used/ Rec'd
5601	Intra-county expense							
5601.100	Intra-county expense Technology services	42,956.00	.00	42,956.00	2,593.56	.00	23,100.97	54
5601.200	Intra-county expense Insurance	3,070.00	.00	3,070.00	255.83	.00	1,279.15	42
5601.300	Intra-county expense Other departmental	1,510.00	.00	1,510.00	30.00	.00	30.00	2
5601.350	Intra-county expense Highway	1,000.00	.00	1,000.00	186.85	.00	186.85	19
5601.400	Intra-county expense Copy center	1,000.00	.00	1,000.00	42.00	.00	132.46	13
5601.450	Intra-county expense Departmental copiers	469.00	.00	469.00	39.08	.00	195.40	42
5601.550	Intra-county expense Document center	7,593.00	.00	7,593.00	959.15	.00	3,503.13	46
	5601 - Intra-county expense Totals	\$57,598.00	\$0.00	\$57,598.00	\$4,106.47	\$0.00	\$28,427.96	49%
5700	Contracted services	44,719.00	.00	44,719.00	2,731.00	19,808.30	12,191.70	72
5810	Tax deed	60,000.00	.00	60,000.00	3,356.90	.00	10,848.10	18
5815	Tax refund							
5815.100	Tax refund Personal property	6,000.00	.00	6,000.00	.00	.00	7,039.09	117
5815.110	Tax refund Real estate property	2,000.00	.00	2,000.00	.00	.00	.00	0
	5815 - Tax refund Totals	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,039.09	88%
5835	Soil testing	2,500.00	.00	2,500.00	.00	.00	2,856.70	114
	Division 001 - General Totals	\$705,255.00	\$4,518.00	\$709,773.00	\$41,893.80	\$20,138.20	\$236,338.07	36%
	Department 080 - Treasurer Totals	\$705,255.00	\$4,518.00	\$709,773.00	\$41,893.80	\$20,138.20	\$236,338.07	36%
	EXPENSE TOTALS	\$705,255.00	\$4,518.00	\$709,773.00	\$41,893.80	\$20,138.20	\$236,338.07	36%
	Fund 100 - General Fund Totals	\$0.00	(\$1.00)	(\$1.00)	\$52,344.78	(\$20,138.20)	\$676,174.66	
	REVENUE TOTALS	705,255.00	4,517.00	709,772.00	94,238.58	.00	912,512.73	129%
	EXPENSE TOTALS	705,255.00	4,518.00	709,773.00	41,893.80	20,138.20	236,338.07	36%
	Grand Totals	\$0.00	(\$1.00)	(\$1.00)	\$52,344.78	(\$20,138.20)	\$676,174.66	
	REVENUE TOTALS	705,255.00	4,517.00	709,772.00	94,238.58	.00	912,512.73	129%
	EXPENSE TOTALS	705,255.00	4,518.00	709,773.00	41,893.80	20,138.20	236,338.07	36%
	Grand Totals	\$0.00	(\$1.00)	(\$1.00)	\$52,344.78	(\$20,138.20)	\$676,174.66	

Zeller, Paul D.

To: Kenneth Rovinski
Subject: RE: Message from Unknown sender (8004507260)

Hi Ken,

Here and attached is the calculation for the City of Green Bay purchase of Parcel 3-1063-2 at 227 S. Buchanan St.:

General Tax Due 2015 through 2018 = \$ 7,396.40
Interest & Penalty due Brown County = \$ 2,391.98
In-Rem Foreclosure Charges 2018/19 = \$ 200.00
\$ 9,988.38

1. In addition to this total, please keep in mind that the City would receive at full year 2019 Property tax bill due Jan. 31, 2020 of approx.. \$ 1,900.
2. The City of Green Bay would also be responsible for any current and/or delinquent Green Bay Water Utility Water/Sewer invoices.
3. The unpaid Special Assessment balance of \$ 5,397.32 would not be part of this sale and would not be paid to City.

Paul Zeller

Brown County Treasurer
Northern Building – 1st Floor – Room 160
305 E. Walnut Street
Green Bay, WI 54301

(☎) Phone # Direct: 920-448-6321
Phone # Office: 920-448-4074
Fax: 920-448-6341
(✉) email: Paul.Zeller@browncountywi.gov

From: Kenneth Rovinski <KennethRo@greenbaywi.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 3:50 PM
To: Zeller, Paul D. <Paul.Zeller@browncountywi.gov>
Subject: Re: Message from Unknown sender (8004507260)

We are very interested. If you can put a number to it by next Wednesday I can get it put on the June 4th RDA agenda.

Thanks,
Ken

Sent from my iPhone

On May 15, 2019, at 3:47 PM, Zeller, Paul D. <Paul.Zeller@browncountywi.gov> wrote:

Hi Ken,
I will take care of this call from WPS.

July 17, 2019

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION ACQUIRING TAX DELINQUENT LAND ADJACENT TO THE FOX
RIVER TRAIL FOR TRAIL PARKING**

WHEREAS, Brown County ("County") manages over 20 miles of the Fox River State Recreational Trail through its Parks Department; and

WHEREAS, the County recognizes the lack of legal parking areas along the trail between De Pere and Greenleaf, a distance of approximately eight miles, and that trail patrons have been parking illegally on Town roads and in farm field access drives creating an unsafe environment; and

WHEREAS, the County is now the owner of parcels R-235-1 and R-319-1 in the Town of Rockland due to unpaid taxes and these parcels have the ability to be developed into parking and trailhead locations; and

WHEREAS, the County Parks Department would like to purchase parcels R-235-1 and R-319-1 from the County Treasurer's Office, both approximately one acre in size to better accommodate trail needs; and the Friends of the Fox River Trail is interested in donating the full acquisition costs to the County Parks Department.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors hereby directs that County staff and administration take necessary action to acquire both parcels under the Parks Department for future parking and trail access locations.

Fiscal Note: This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund.

Zeller, Paul D.

From: Zeller, Paul D.
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 5:39 PM
To: Holden, Andrea J.; Weininger, Chad J.; Hemery, David P.
Cc: Kriese, Matt M.
Subject: RE: Resolution to Acquire 2 parcels along the FRT

Hello Matt,

Below are the final complete purchase figures for the Parcels you are interested in:
(Ironically both the same)

R-235-1 = \$ 392.29 + a \$30 Deed Recording Fee necessary to change the Deed Title = \$ 422.29 Total

R-319-1 = \$ 392.29 + a \$30 Deed Recording Fee necessary to change the Deed Title = \$ 422.29 Total

Both have 3-20-2019 Assessed Values of \$ 2,200 which will result in a 2019 Property Tax bill of approximately \$ 37 each parcel. The 2019 property tax bills can be budgeted for and paid in 2020 (by 1-31-20) if the Parks Dept. wishes to push that to 2020. We cannot take and hold these payment in-advance until 8-1-19.

The Parcels will become exempt from taxation 1-1-2020 for the 2020 tax year and beyond.

Please let me know if any further purchase info is needed. I will place these Parcels on the 7-19-2019 Administration Committee agenda for sale consideration.

Sincerely,

Paul Zeller

Brown County Treasurer

Northern Building – 1st Floor – Room 160

305 E. Walnut Street

Green Bay, WI 54301

(☎) Phone # Direct: 920-448-6321

Phone # Office: 920-448-4074

Fax: 920-448-6341

(✉) email: Paul.Zeller@browncountywi.gov

From: Holden, Andrea J. <Andrea.Holden@browncountywi.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:53 PM

To: Weininger, Chad J. <Chad.Weininger@browncountywi.gov>; Hemery, David P. <david.hemery@browncountywi.gov>

Cc: Zeller, Paul D. <Paul.Zeller@browncountywi.gov>; Kriese, Matt M. <Matt.Kriese@browncountywi.gov>

Subject: RE: Resolution to Acquire 2 parcels along the FRT

I've numbered and formatted the attached resolution and submission form from Parks, but it still requires fiscal note/review and Corp Counsel review.

Once approved, this will need to be sent to County Board and County Clerk's office for inclusion on the below-listed agendas:

Ed & Rec 6/27

County Board 7/17



May 31, 2019

Brown County
Attn: Mr. Paul Zeller
305 East Walnut Street
Green Bay, WI 54305

KEEP THIS DOCUMENT WITH YOUR PROPERTY RECORDS

SUBJECT: Final Case Closure with Continuing Obligations
Petro Mart LLC (former) – LGU, 1739 Main Street, Green Bay, WI
DNR BRRTS Activity # 03-05-555528

Dear Mr. Zeller:

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) considers the Petro Mart LLC (former) – LGU contamination case closed, with continuing obligations. The closure applies to Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and/or lead in soil and/or groundwater. No further investigation or remediation is required at this time. However, you, future property owners and occupants must comply with the continuing obligations as explained in the conditions of closure in this letter. Please read over this letter closely to ensure that you comply with all conditions and other on-going requirements. Provide this letter to anyone who purchases, rents or leases this property from you.

This final closure decision is based on the correspondence and data provided, and is issued under chs. NR 726 and 727, Wis. Adm. Code. The Northeast Region (NER) Closure Committee reviewed the request for closure on April 17, 2019. The NER Closure Committee reviewed this environmental remediation case for compliance with state laws and standards. A request for remaining actions needed was issued by the DNR on April 25, 2019, and documentation that the conditions in that letter were met was received on May 30, 2019.

Historically this property was operated as a gasoline station. The most recently operated Underground Storage Tank (UST) system was removed in 2010 and soil contamination was identified. The property is currently a grass covered vacant lot with no buildings. All known USTs have been removed. Petroleum contaminated soil above standards remains in the vicinity of the most recent USTs and dispensers. Groundwater was not impacted above standards. The conditions of closure and continuing obligations required were based on the property being used for commercial purposes.

Continuing Obligations

The continuing obligations for this site are summarized below. Further details on actions required are found in the section Closure Conditions.

- Residual soil contamination exists that must be properly managed should it be excavated or removed.

The DNR fact sheet "Continuing Obligations for Environmental Protection," RR-819, helps to explain a property owner's responsibility for continuing obligations on their property. The fact sheet may be obtained at <http://dnr.wi.gov/files/PDF/pubs/rr/RR819.pdf>.

May 31, 2019
Mr. Zeller
Final Closure Letter
Petro Mart LLC (former) – LGU - BRRTS # 03-05-555528

DNR Database

This site will be included on the Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS) on the Web (BOTW) at dnr.wi.gov and search "BOTW", to provide public notice of residual contamination and of any continuing obligations. The site can also be viewed on the Remediation and Redevelopment Sites Map (RRSM), a map view, at dnr.wi.gov and search "RRSM".

The DNR's approval prior to well construction or reconstruction is required in accordance with s. NR 812.09 (4) (w), Wis. Adm. Code. This requirement applies to private drinking water wells and high capacity wells. To obtain approval, complete and submit Form 3300-254 to the DNR Drinking and Groundwater program's regional water supply specialist. This form can be obtained on-line at dnr.wi.gov and search "3300-254."

All site information is also on file at the Northeast Regional DNR office, at 2984 Shawano Avenue, Green Bay, WI. This letter and information that was submitted with your closure request application, including any maps, can be found as a PDF on BOTW.

Closure Conditions

Compliance with the requirements of this letter is a responsibility to which you, and any subsequent property owners must adhere. DNR staff will conduct periodic prearranged inspections to ensure that the conditions included in this letter are met. If these requirements are not followed, the DNR may take enforcement action under s. 292.11, Wis. Stats. to ensure compliance with the specified requirements, limitations or other conditions related to the property.

Please send written notifications in accordance with the following requirements to:

Department of Natural Resources
Attn: Remediation and Redevelopment Program Environmental Program Associate
2984 Shawano Avenue
Green Bay, WI 54313

Residual Soil Contamination (ch. NR 718, or ch. 289, Stats.; chs. 500 to 536, Wis. Adm. Code)

Soil contamination remains as indicated on the attached map (Residual Soil Contamination; Figure B.2.B; July 2018). If contaminated soil is excavated in the future, the property owner at the time of excavation must sample and analyze the excavated soil to determine if contamination remains. If sampling confirms that contamination is present, the property owner at the time of excavation will need to determine whether the material is considered solid or hazardous waste and ensure that any storage, treatment or disposal is in compliance with applicable standards and rules. Contaminated soil may be managed in accordance with ch. NR 718, Wis. Adm. Code, with prior DNR approval.

In addition, all current and future owners and occupants of the property need to be aware that excavation of the contaminated soil may pose an inhalation or other direct contact hazard and as a result special precautions may need to be taken to prevent a direct contact health threat to humans.

Depending on site-specific conditions, construction over contaminated soils or groundwater may result in vapor migration of contaminants into enclosed structures or migration along newly placed underground utility lines. The potential for vapor inhalation and means of mitigation should be evaluated when planning any future redevelopment, and measures should be taken to ensure the continued protection of public health, safety, welfare and the environment at the site.

May 31, 2019
Mr. Zeller
Final Closure Letter
Petro Mart LLC (former) – LGU - BRRTS # 03-05-555528

More than 15 feet of soil fill material is present at this site in the areas explored during the site investigation activities. It is anticipated that this material was brought in historically to raise the general grade in the area to facilitate development. Some waste material (concrete, brick, slag, glass, etc.) is present in the subsurface within the soil fill material on this property. If excavated in the future, this material should be properly handled and/or disposed in compliance with applicable standards and rules.

In Closing

Please be aware that the case may be reopened pursuant to s. NR 727.13, Wis. Adm. Code, for any of the following situations:

- if additional information regarding site conditions indicates that contamination on or from the site poses a threat to public health, safety, or welfare or to the environment,
- if the property owner does not comply with the conditions of closure, or
- a property owner fails to maintain or comply with a continuing obligation (imposed under this closure approval letter).

The DNR appreciates your efforts to restore the environment at this site. If you have any questions regarding this closure decision or anything outlined in this letter, please contact Keld Lauridsen at (920) 662-5420, or at Keld.Lauridsen@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,



Roxanne N. Chronert
Team Supervisor, Northeast Region
Remediation and Redevelopment Program



Attachment:

- Residual Soil Contamination; Figure B.2.B; July 2018

ec: Erin Mader, Bay Environmental Strategies, Inc. (eemader@bayenvironmental.com)



- Estimated Property Line
- Estimated Soil and Residual Soil Contamination
- ⊕ Soil Boring/Temporary Monitoring Well
- Est. TSSA Soil Sample Location

Figure	B.2.B Residual Soil Contamination	
Site Location	1739 Main Street Green Bay, Wisconsin	
Source	Obtained from Brown County GIS Website	Client: Brown County Treasurer
		Date: July 2018
		Scale: 1:500
		Drawn By: EEM

Attn: Brown County Board, Tom Sieber, distinguished members

I write to you today regarding a 28 Day Notice Terminating Tenancy I have received regarding my home in Bellevue. Through fault of my own I have either overlooked, procrastinated, or reacted to the seriousness of my situation. My failure to address the back taxes on my property have led to the county taking the deed to my property and an order to vacate by July 5th.

This situation is a result of my negligence. I accept that responsibility. My reason for writing to you today is to provide a little background on my situation and to appeal to you to allow me to right my errors and appeal to your humanity to allow me to maintain our home.

Approximately 4 ½ years ago I lost my ex-wife to cancer. During her last of 3 battles with cancer I promised her to be there for her and our daughters. One of the actions I took was to pay off the mortgage of my home to remove that debt and to help me provide full time support to our daughters. Over the course of years I however struggled to keep up my property taxes.

This past year I also have been dealing with a new family crisis. In June of 2018 my mother in Florida was diagnosed with lung cancer. She resides with my special needs brother and he is solely dependent on her. My father Maj. John Dachelet (ret) passed away 8 years ago. Since her diagnosis I have been back and forth weeks at a time to provide care for her and my brother. I returned to Green Bay on Wednesday May 29th and was served Thursday afternoon the 28 day Notice. I met with Treasurer Zeller on Friday who explained in detail that I was a day late to be taking action. I then spoke with Brn County Asst Council Brent Haroldson who suggested that I appeal to this Board.

Because my mother's cancer relapse compounded by pneumonia infection she is not expected to live long. Prior to my return to Green Bay I made arrangements for my daughters and granddaughter to come to Florida to say goodbye to my mom. We are all going Wednesday June 5th this making it impossible for me to stand before you and ask for your humanitarian compassion to allow me to pay my tax debt and allow me to retain the deed to my property. As I put all of my savings into our home there is no mortgage company debt that was involved. I truly wish I could be present to represent myself. I hope I have done well to show that I am a good person. I fear that in losing my home due to my stupid mistakes now leaves my youngest daughter, my special needs brother whom I will now be a lifetime guardian of, and myself homeless when we return to bury my mother.

If you can see the sincerity in my commitment to pay immediately my past debt and allow me to undo this situation I would be eternally grateful.

Best regards & Thank you for your time.

Bradley Dachelet bdachelet@new.rr.com 920-366-4484

2476 Valley Heights Dr., Green Bay, WI 54311

66

Parcel No B-367-8

Taken in Rem: April 10, 2019

Date Municipality offered: _____

Date Letter Sent to former owner: _____

TAX YEAR	GENERAL TAX	INTEREST & PENALTY	SPECIAL ASSESSMENT	INTEREST * PENALTY	
2018	3,709.40	111.28	1,392.76	41.78	5,255.22
2017	3,601.30	810.30	1,710.98	384.97	6,507.55
2016	3,521.70	1,426.29	1,027.96	416.32	6,392.27
2015	3,461.70	2,025.09	1,083.13	633.63	7,203.55
2014	-	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-	-
2012	-	-	-	-	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-
2010	-	-	-	-	-
2009	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIALS NOT ON TAX ROLL	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	14,294.10	4,372.96	5,214.83	1,476.70	25,358.59

Out of Pocket Charges

In-Rem charges	200.00
Guardian Ad Litem	
Total Charges	200.00
Total Charges & Taxes	25,558.59

BROWN COUNTY TREASURER
FORECLOSURE OF TAX LIENS BY ACTION IN REM (75.521 WI STATUTES)

INFORMATIONAL RECORD

20__ IN REM

PARCEL NUMBER: B-367-8

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

Current Owner's Name: Bradley T Dachelet

Property Address: 2476 Valley Heights Dr

Legal Description: Lot Eight (8), according to the recorded Plat of Kaster's Addition to Rustic Subdivision, in the Town of Bellevue, East side of Fox River, Brown County, Wisconsin.

VESTING INFORMATION (can combine this info with section below)

Current Grantee (s) & Address of Record:

Bradley T Dachelet

Address: 2476 Valley Heights Dr
Green Bay, WI 54311-6758

OPEN MORTGAGE INFORMATION (a copy is not needed)

Current Unsatisfied Mortgagee(s) & mailing Address:

NONE FOUND.

Current Land Contract(s) & mailing Address:

NONE FOUND.

Current Lis Pendens, Unsatisfied Judgments/Liens, Tax Liens & Address

Case No. with brief description and mailing address if noted.

State Tax Liens: 16-TW-532 - Dept. Of Revenue vs. Bradley Dachelet in the amount of \$19,536.90.

12-CV-1914 - Capital One Bank USA NA (140 E Shore Dr 12017-0380, Glen Allen, VA 23059) vs
Bradley T Dachelet in the amount of \$14,256.20.

Search Period: 9/4/2018

Completed By: A to Z Searching & Closing, LLC

6e

Loehlein, Alicia A.

To: lisalappen@hotmail.com

From: lisalappen@hotmail.com <lisalappen@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 7:52 AM

To: Loehlein, Alicia A. <Alicia.Loehlein@browncountywi.gov>

Hi my name is Lisa Lappen and I am asking if I can be put on July's agenda to talk to you about my property on 852 Shawano Ave Green Bay wi. I called Mr. Brett Heraldson and he told me to contact you to get on the agenda for July. Thank You for your time.

Parcel No 3-40

Taken in Rem: July 17, 2019

Date Municipality offered: _____

Date Letter Sent to former owner: _____

TAX YEAR	GENERAL TAX	INTEREST & PENALTY	SPECIAL ASSESSMENT	INTEREST * PENALTY	
2018	1,029.40	61.76	1,668.73	100.12	2,860.01
2017	1,048.40	283.07	991.69	267.76	2,590.92
2016	1,025.20	461.33	242.47	109.11	1,838.11
2015	539.23	339.72			878.95
2014	-	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-			-
2012	-	-			-
2011	-	-			-
2010					-
2009					-
SPECIALS NOT ON TAX ROLL					-
TOTALS	3,642.23	1,145.88	2,902.89	476.99	8,167.99

Out of Pocket Charges

In-Rem charges	200.00
Guardian Ad Litem	
Total Charges	<u>200.00</u>
Total Charges & Taxes	8,367.99

BROWN COUNTY TREASURER
FORECLOSURE OF TAX LIENS BY ACTION IN REM (75.521 WI STATUTES)
Report Number: WGB18-09256050-3

INFORMATIONAL RECORD

PARCEL NUMBER: 3-40

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP INFORMATION:

Owners Name from Tax Record: Perry J Lappen

Property Address: 852 Shawano Av

Legal Description: Lot 5 and the Westerly 7 feet of Lot 6, G.A. Walter Jr.'s Subdivision of Part of Lot 1 J.A. Fisk's Addition to Fort Howard, now part of the City of Green Bay, Brown County, Wisconsin.

INFORMATION:

Grantee(s) from last deed of record and address of record (from tax record):

Perry J Lappen
852 Shawano Av
Green Bay, WI 54303-2869

OPEN MORTGAGE INFORMATION:

Unsatisfied Mortgagee(s) and Address:

DLJ Mortgage Capital, Inc.

Located at 11 Madison Avenue 4th Floor, New York, NY 10010

Document Number 2315988 & 2805117

Land Contract(s) and Address: None

Lis Pendens, Unsatisfied Judgments/Liens and Address:

Judgment docketed 10/24/2016 – 2016SC004464

Debtor: Lisa A Lappen, 852 Shawano Ave, Green Bay, WI 54303

Creditor: Baycare Aurora LLC, PO Box 343910, Milwaukee, WI 53215

State Tax Liens: None

Federal Tax Liens: None

SEARCH PERIOD: 05/13/1994 to 09/08/2018 at 12:01 A.M.

COMPLETED BY: Lighthouse Title, Inc.

By: Tracy L. Bader

Dated: 09/19/2018

This Report is for informational purposes only. There is no liability for Lighthouse Title, Inc. in issuing this report. This report is not a title insurance commitment or policy and should not be relied upon in place of such. It is not the intention of Lighthouse Title, Inc. to provide any type of express or implied warranty, guaranty, or indemnity with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in the report. If this report is to be used by the customer as the search required in order for the customer to issue a title insurance commitment or policy, or if the information contained in this report is resold, the customer does so at their own risk. In order to obtain information from the company which will carry the full liability of a title insurance commitment or policy, Lighthouse Title, Inc. will issue, if requested, a commitment of title insurance and will charge a fee in compliance with rates filed with the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance.

6

Loehlein, Alicia A.

To: Sieber, Tom T.
Subject: RE: 347 Greene Ave.

Tom,

Thanks for speaking with me on the phone this week. Here is the information for the property:

Owner: Jean Weinshel
Address: 347 Greene Avenue

I would like to address a sale back of this property to Ms. Weinshel at the next meeting of the Administration Committee, on July 17 @5pm. As I understand from our call, the meeting is in Room 207 of City Hall.

I will provide other documents to the committee and will attempt to have them to the County Board office by Monday, July 15.

Thank you for your time,

Andy Williams
Attorney for Ms. Weinshel

--

**** IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIAL NOTICE****

The contents of this message, along with any attachments, are confidential and subject to the attorney/client and/or attorney work-product privileges.

If you are not the intended recipient(s) of this message, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please destroy this message immediately and notify the sender that you received this message in error.

No permission is given for persons other than the intended recipient(s) to read or disclose the contents of this message.

Parcel No AL-1094-3

Taken in Rem: April 10, 2019

Date Municipality offered: _____

Date Letter Sent to former owner: _____

TAX YEAR	GENERAL TAX	INTEREST & PENALTY	SPECIAL ASSESSMENT	INTEREST * PENALTY	
2018	8,149.90	244.50	810.58	24.32	9,229.30
2017	8,274.10	1,861.68	909.56	204.65	11,249.99
2016	8,070.50	3,268.56	488.62	197.89	12,025.57
2015	3,974.55	2,325.11	-	-	6,299.66
2014	-	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-	-
2012	-	-	-	-	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-
2010	-	-	-	-	-
2009	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIALS NOT ON TAX ROLL	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	28,469.05	7,699.85	2,208.76	426.86	38,804.52

Out of Pocket Charges

In-Rem charges	200.00
Guardian Ad Litem	
Total Charges	200.00
Total Charges & Taxes	39,004.52

6

**BROWN COUNTY TREASURER
FORECLOSURE OF TAX LIENS BY ACTION IN REM (75.521 WI STATUTES)**

INFORMATIONAL RECORD

20__ IN REM

PARCEL NUMBER: AL-1094-3

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

Current Owner's Name: Jean D Weinschel

Property Address: 347 Greene Ave

Legal Description: Part of Lot Twenty-six (26), according to the recorded Plat of Greene & Vroman's Subdivision No. 3, in the Village of Allouez, Brown County, Wisconsin and described as follows:
Beginning at the junction of the easterly line of Oakwood Avenue and the northerly line of East Greene Avenue; thence South 63 deg 32 min East, along said northerly line of East Greene Avenue 445.5 feet to the southwest corner of the parcel of land to be described, being the point of beginning of this description; continuing thence South 63 deg 32 min East, 150 feet to the southeast corner of said Lot 26; thence North 25 deg 51 min East 418.39 feet along the easterly line of said Lot 26; thence North 63 deg 13 min West 147.09 feet; thence South 26 deg 41 min West 418.10 feet to the point of beginning, EXCEPT that part thereof described in Jacket 16427 Records, Image 55.

VESTING INFORMATION (can combine this info with section below)

Current Grantee (s) & Address of Record:
Jean Douglas Weinschel

Address: 2221 S Webster Ave. A-173
Green Bay, WI 54301

OPEN MORTGAGE INFORMATION (a copy is not needed)

Current Unsatisfied Mortgagee(s) & mailing Address:
Mortgage from Jean D Weinschel to Associated Bank (PO Box 208, Stevens Point, WI 54481-0226) in the amount of \$225,000.00 recorded 10/20/04 as Document No. 2152309.

Current Lis Pendens, Unsatisfied Judgments/Liens, Tax Liens & Address
Case No. with brief description and mailing address if noted.

None found.

Search Period: 9/9/2018

Completed By: A to Z Searching & Closing

ALLOUEZ WATER DEPARTMENT
1900 LIBAL STREET
GREEN BAY, WI 54301

JEAN WEINSHEL

347 GREENE AVENUE

ACCOUNT NUMBER 02-05780-00

Date	Type	Reference	Credits	Debits	Cumulative Balance
04/23/2019	Bill	BILL 3/1/2019 - 4/1/2019		57.57	513.40
04/18/2019	Penalty	Past Due		4.30	455.83
03/25/2019	Bill	BILL 2/1/2019 - 3/1/2019		79.17	451.53
03/19/2019	Penalty	Past Due		3.69	372.36
02/21/2019	Bill	BILL 12/29/2018 - 2/1/2019		57.57	368.67
02/20/2019	Penalty	Past Due		3.08	311.10
01/21/2019	Bill	BILL 11/24/2018 - 12/29/2018		57.94	308.02
01/17/2019	Penalty	Past Due		2.48	250.08
12/20/2018	Bill	BILL 10/25/2018 - 11/24/2018		61.67	247.60
12/19/2018	Penalty	Past Due		1.84	185.93
11/26/2018	Bill	BILL 9/25/2018 - 10/25/2018		54.69	184.09
11/20/2018	Penalty	Past Due		1.28	129.40
11/16/2018	Lien	Lien for \$97.18	-97.18		128.12
11/16/2018	Lien	Lien for \$293.93	-293.93		225.30
11/16/2018	Lien	Lien for \$419.47	-419.47		519.23
11/16/2018	Collection Charge	Lien for \$736.89		73.69	938.70
11/16/2018	Lien	Lien for \$736.89		0.00	865.01
10/22/2018	Bill	BILL 8/26/2018 - 9/25/2018		54.69	865.01
10/19/2018	Penalty	Past Due		8.02	810.32
10/15/2018	Collection/Lien Notice Printed	Collection Notice Mailed		0.00	802.30
09/20/2018	Bill	BILL 7/27/2018 - 8/26/2018		65.41	802.30
09/19/2018	Penalty	Past Due		7.30	736.89
08/21/2018	Bill	BILL 6/27/2018 - 7/27/2018		60.43	729.59
08/20/2018	Penalty	Past Due		6.63	669.16
07/20/2018	Bill	BILL 5/28/2018 - 6/27/2018		65.41	662.53
07/18/2018	Penalty	Past Due		5.91	597.12
06/21/2018	Bill	BILL 4/28/2018 - 5/28/2018		57.94	591.21

19-051

BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

Category	Approval Level
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Reallocation from one account to another in the same level of appropriation	Dept Head
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reallocation due to a technical correction that could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reallocation to another account strictly for tracking or accounting purposes• Allocation of budgeted prior year grant not completed in the prior year	Director of Admin
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Any change in any item within the Outlay account which does not require the reallocation of funds from another level of appropriation	County Exec
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Any change in appropriation from an official action taken by the County Board (i.e., resolution, ordinance change, etc.)	County Exec
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 a) Reallocation of up to 10% of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts).	Admin Comm
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 b) Reallocation of more than 10% of the funds originally appropriated between any of the levels of appropriation.	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 Reallocation between two or more departments, regardless of amount	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> 7 Any increase in expenses with an offsetting increase in revenue	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Any allocation from a department's fund balance	Oversight Comm 2/3 County Board
9 Any allocation from the County's General Fund (requires separate Resolution) After County Board approval of the resolution, a Category 4 budget adjustment must be prepared.	Oversight Comm Admin Committee 2/3 County Board

Justification for Budget Change:

This budget adjustment is to use a portion of the 2019 Contingency funding to obtain an estimate for the potential Courthouse Security project per the PD&T Committee action taken on June 3, 2019.

Fiscal Impact*: \$10,000

Contingency Fund Balance \$293,000

*Enter \$0 if reclassifying previously budgeted funds. Enter actual dollar amount if new revenue or expense.

Increase	Decrease	Account #	Account Title	Amount
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.038.5708	Facilities Professional Services	\$10,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.054.038.9004	Facilities Intrafund Transfer In	\$10,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	100.090.9005	General Government Intrafund Transfer Out	\$10,000
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100.090.5394	General Government Contingency	\$10,000
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

20 6/11/19

Y. Paul
Signature of Department Head
Department: Public Works
Date: 6/11/19

AUTHORIZATIONS
[Signature]
Signature of DOA or Executive
Date: 7/7/19

6a